

Remarks**ELECTION/RESTRICTION:**

Applicant would like to clarify their right to reintroduce restricted claims that have been previously cancelled conditional upon the allowance of a generic claim. Applicant believes that independent claims 15 and 34 are currently generic. A notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

DRAWING OBJECTION:

The Office Action objects to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a) for failing to show a "transducer" as recited in claim 35. With this amendment, figure 3 has been amended to show transducer 128. Also, the specification has been amended on page 10, line 18, to recite "transducer 128 (shown in figure 3)". No new matter has been added because the application as filed disclosed a transducer in a slider. (See page 10, lines 18 and 24; and page 11, lines 20-21). Therefore, Applicant believes this objection should be withdrawn and respectfully requests a notice to that effect.

SPECIFICATION OBJECTIONS:

Claim 34 is objected to because "wherein the first surface positioned" is not clear. With this amendment, claim 34 now recites "wherein the first surface is positioned". Applicant believes that this objection has been addressed and cured, therefore Applicant asks that this objection be withdrawn and a notice to that effect.

CLAIM REJECTIONS:

Claims 17-18, and 38-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. With this amendment, claims 17 and 38 have been amended to recite "wherein the slider includes first, second, third, and fourth interconnect pads disposed on the second surface of the flex circuit". Also, claims 18, 38 and 39 have been amended to change "slider/MR head" to - slider -. Applicant believes that these amendments overcome the aforementioned rejections and therefore ask withdrawal of said rejections. A notice of this withdrawal is respectfully requested.

Claims 15-18 and 34-41 are currently rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Zarouri et al. (US 5,771,138). Applicant would like to traverse this rejection in view of the amendments above.

Independent claims 15 and 34 both recite, in part, a slider having a flex circuit with a first and second surface. The first and second surface oppose each other. The first surface of the flex circuit is attached to the top of the slider and either conductive material or an interconnect pad is positioned on the second surface. Therefore, the interconnect pad or the conductive material that is positioned on the flex circuit must be facing the suspension which facilitates for a efficient and cost effective way to build a head gimbal assembly (see generally page 13 of the detailed description).

Zarouri discloses, in figure 1E and associated description, a flex circuit 8 that is attached to flexure 6. Figure 1E further shows conductors 9 which provide for an electrical connection between the transducing wires and the slider bond pads. Upon a closer review of figure 1E, it is apparent that conductors 9 are routed between the slider and the flex circuit, and therefore does not disclose the above mentioned limitation in claims 15 and 34 (claims 15 and 34 require either conductive material or an interconnect pad be between the flex circuit and the suspension, not the flex circuit and the slider). Further, claim 34 recites an interconnect pad positioned on the flex circuit for electrical connection to the conductive material on the suspension. Zarouri fails to disclose this limitation as well. Because Zarouri does not disclose, teach or suggest all the limitation in claims 15 and 34, there can be no anticipation. The Applicant respectfully requests the rejection be withdrawn and a notice to that effect.

Claims 15 and 28-29 are currently rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Anderson et al. (US 5,768,062). Applicant would like to traverse the Anderson reference in regard to independent claims 15 and 34.

In the previous response, Applicant argued that Anderson does not disclose, teach or suggest a flex circuit attached to the top of the slider, and therefore

Anderson cannot anticipate claim 15 (or 34) of the present invention. In response to this argument that Office Action (on page 11) states “[n]ote that element 5b of Anderson may be considered a flex circuit as it is flexible and contains circuit traces.” The Applicant respectfully argues that element 5b can not be considered a “flex circuit” for two reasons. First, flex circuit is clearly defined in the present invention to include conductive material and “a dielectric material, for example, polyimide. The conductive material can be patterned on the dielectric material and/or laminated into a single sheet lamination, preferably covered by an insulating cover (not shown).” (see page 16, lines 13-16). The present invention also makes a point to clearly define the flexure or gimbal as being an element different from the flex circuit. (See the Background section generally). Therefore, it is improper to equate the gimbal/flexure element 5b of Anderson to the flex circuit of claims 15 and 34. The second reason why element 5b cannot be considered a “flex circuit” is because Anderson effectively teaches away from this type of interpretation. Anderson clearly describes use of a “flex circuit” in two areas of the “actuator armstack”. Anderson mentions the use of a polyimide on the actuator arm and the loadbeam as being separate from the gimbal spring element 5b (see column 6, lines 44-51; and column 8, lines 2-16). Also, Anderson discloses a flexible circuit 5k which is found on the back of the actuator arm. (See column 9, lines 44-52). Anderson fails to suggest, teach or disclose putting a flex circuit on the top of the slider so that an interconnect pad or conductive material on the flex circuit is facing the suspension as recited in claims 15 and 34. Applicant respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn and a notice to that effect.

By: Brendan J. Hanley

Brendan J. Hanley

Reg. No. 52,429

Intellectual Property Department – NRW097

Seagate Technology LLC

7801 Computer Avenue South

Bloomington, MN 55435

Telephone: (952) 402-7115

Attorney for Applicants

Please address all correspondence to:

Seagate Technology LLC

Intellectual Property Department – NRW097

7801 Computer Avenue South

Bloomington, MN 55435

Phone: (952) 402-7115

Fax: (952) 402-8187

Date: 23 December 2004

CERTIFICATION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.8

Date of Deposit: 23 December 2004

I hereby certify that this Response and the documents referred to as attached therein are being transmitted via facsimile to facsimile number 703-872-9306 at the United States Patent and Trademark Office Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown above.

Heidi McCarty

Heidi McCarty